

From: [POULSEN Mike](#)
To: [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)
Cc: [Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [PETERSON Jenn L](#)
Subject: RE: Presentation of Data
Date: 01/15/2008 09:52 AM

Eric -

OK, I understand now. I'm not sure I should weigh in on the eco question because I expect there are issues that I'm not on top of. For HH, I think I would be fine with figures showing risk (moving beyond the screening step).

- Mike

-----Original Message-----

From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov
[mailto:Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, January 15, 2008 9:08 AM
To: POULSEN Mike
Cc: Shephard.Burt@epamail.epa.gov; Goulet.Joe@epamail.epa.gov; PETERSON Jenn L
Subject: RE: Presentation of Data

I think the question is whether to present the data based on a comparison to screening level values or more refined risk estimates. This may not be so much of an issue for the HHRA but for the ERA, we have a large number of chemicals that screen in and I wonder about having to map all of them. Our comments so far are inconsistent on this point.

Eric

"POULSEN Mike"
<POULSEN.Mike@deq.state.or.us>

01/15/2008 08:11 AM

To
Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
cc
Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, "PETERSON Jenn L"
<PETERSON.Jenn@deq.state.or.us>
Subject
RE: Presentation of Data

Eric -

I don't follow what the question/issue is here. Are you looking to limit the number of figures in the RI/RA, and focus on chemicals showing risk? Generally we can get a good handle on risk by seeing the exceedances of screening levels. But there are other factors that are considered in the final risk evaluation. Is there a specific comment on the Round 2 Report that you are referring to?

- Mike

-----Original Message-----

From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov
[mailto:Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 14, 2008 11:27 PM ???
To: Goulet.Joe@epamail.epa.gov; Shephard.Burt@epamail.epa.gov; POULSEN Mike
Subject: Presentation of Data
Importance: High

In the Round 2 Report, I believe that we wanted data presented relative to PRGs (screening levels) for the purpose of identifying data gaps. While this may be useful for data gap identification since we presumably do not know what chemicals are contributing most to risk, I wonder if this is appropriate for the draft RI Report. A lot of chemicals screen in. I would rather the data presentation (i.e., indicator chemicals) focus on chemicals that were identified as presenting risk based on the BRA.

Just asking for a reality check here - is this ok? I think it is cleaner.

Thanks, Eric